UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,582	02/25/2002	Benjamin Slotznick	8899-42U1	6072

570	7590	11/18/2005	

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/084,582	SLOTZNICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 August 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-11, 16-27, 33-43 and 48-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *12-15, 28-32, 44-47 and 60-64* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) *22-27 and 54-59* is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 16-21, 33-36, 38-40, 42, 43 and 48-53* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *5, 9, 37 and 41* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Remarks filed on 8/26/2005.

2.   Claims 1-11, 16-27, 33-43 and 48-59 are pending in the application.

3.   Claims 8, 40, 16, 48 are amended.

4.   Claims 12-15, 28-32, 44-47 and 60-64 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

5.   .   Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/20054 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page twelve of Remarks that Kiraly et al. (6,324,511) do

not teach step (a) of claims 16 and 48. Step (a) of claims 16 and 48 recites positioning

a pointing device over an active region of a grammatical unit, the grammatical unit being

automatically highlighted whenever the pointing device is over the active region.

However, Kiraly et al. teaches a cursor control device (col. 6, lines 6-7). Kiraly et al.

further teach that the system is able to determine, when a web page is be read, which

part of the source document to read, this part being highlighted (col. 9, lines 15-18).

The highlighted portion of the text to be read would have to have been selected by

some means to indicate that this part is to be read and not the entire document, since

the entire document is read if there is no highlighted part (col. 9, lines 16-18). Where it

would be necessary that since a cursor control device is available to the user, the user

would be able to use that device to highlight a portion of the web page that was to be

read aloud, where the cursor would have to be placed over the text to highlight it.

The applicant argues on page thirteen of Remarks that Chung et al. (6,115,686)

does not "reassemble the original we page source code...to form visually displayable

text-to-speech enable web page source code." However, it was indicated in the office

action dated 5/24/2005 that Chung et al. does not teach this, and Kiraly et al. was relied

on to teach this aspect. As stated in the office action Chung et al. does teach

reassembling the original document with the associated tags and event

handlers...wherein when an event associated with an event handler occurs during user

interaction with a display of a text-to-speech enable document, the text-to-speech

software code causes the grammatical unit associated with the tag of the event handler

to automatically spoken (see page 10 of the office action indicated above). The

applicant further argued that Kiraly et al. does not teach reassembling the source

document to form web page source code, as recited in claims 1 and 33. However, the

examiner argues that Kiraly et al. do teach the text-reader is able to access a source of

text-based data (that data could be a web page, supplied by Microsoft explorer, col. 9,

lines 9-11), and the text is displayed in a new window using a preselected standard font

size, and another window with a magnified font size, and then electronically read the

document. Where it would be necessary that since the font of the web page is

changed, the source code relating to the font size of the web page would have to be

changed, changing the source code of the website (col. 6, lines 13-17, and col. 8, lines 8-10). The applicant further argued that Kiraly et al. do no teach the text-based data created is not formatted as a web page that can be subsequently viewed by a browser and/or transmitted over the Internet. However, the examiner argues that Kiraly et al. does teach the changed website is displayed to the user, since the document with the changed font size is displayed in a text window, (col. 6, lines 13-17). Further, the examiner is unable to find within the claim where it is said that the web page is to be transmitted over the Internet, and believes the applicant to be arguing subject matter not found in the claim language.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 5, 9, 37, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claims 5 and 37, Chung et al. (6,115,686) in combination of Kiraly et al. (6,324,511) do not teach or fairly suggest that the step of reassembling the original web page source code of claims 1 and 33, further comprises reassembling the original we page source code with image-related event handlers, where the event handlers invoke

text-to-speech software, causing the text related to the image to be automatically

spoken.

As to claim 9 and 41, Chung et al. in combination with Kiraly et al. do not teach or

fairly suggest replacing the associated address of any links with a new address that

invokes a software program, the software program retrieving the source code of the

links, and the translating the linked pages into a visually displayable text-to-speech

enabled web page.

7.   Claims 22-27, and 54-59 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 22 and 59 disclose when a pointing device is positioned over a link, the

link is automatically highlighted, the associated text is automatically loaded into a text-

to-speech software program to speak the text to the user, and finally automatically

navigating to the address of the link, and that these steps occur sequentially and without

requiring any further user manipulation.

Chung et al. in combination Kiraly et al. do not teach reading the text associated

with the highlighted link, and automatically navigating the link, which has been

highlighted by pointing device.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later

than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on

Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 23-27 and 55-59 are allowable because they are dependent on allowable

subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 16, 21, 48, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Kiraly et al.

As to claims 16 and 48, Kiraly et al. teach:

(a) positioning a pointing device over an active region of a grammatical unit, the

grammatical unit being automatically highlighted whenever the pointing device is over

the active region, (using a cursor control device to select the portion of the text to be

read and then highlighting the text as it is read, col. 6, lines 6-7, 18-25, and col. 9, lines 16-18);

(b) automatically loading the grammatical unit into a text-to-speech engine, the grammatical unit thereby automatically spoken, wherein steps (a) and (b) occur sequentially and without requiring any further user manipulation of the pointing device or any other user interfaces associated with the display device, (the text-reader software automatically begins electronically reading the document aloud one word at a time, and needs no input from the user to continue reading the document, col. 6, lines 17-25).

As to claims 21 and 53, Kiraly et al. teach the pointing device is a mouse, (Fig. 2, element 116).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 17-19, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al as applied to claims 16 and 48 above, and further in view of the prior art disclosed by the applicant.

As to claims 17 and 49, Kiraly et al. do not teach the pointing device persists in the active region of a tag for greater than a preset time period.

However, the prior art disclosed by the applicant teaches the user places cursor focus in front document the user wants read, (page 2, lines 24-28). It would be necessary that the user would have to hold the cursor over the area to be read for a preset time period so the system will be able recognize the mouse location.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the visual display of Kiraly et al. and with the mouse over technique taught by prior art to increase the users control of the system and the flexibility of the system.

As to claims 18 and 50, Kiraly et al. do not teach the preset time period is a human perceivable time period.

However, the prior art disclosed by the applicant teaches the user places cursor focus in front document the user wants read, (page 2, lines 24-28). It would be necessary that the user would hold the cursor over a position to be read, allowing enough time for the user to properly select the position to begin reading, and so the system will be able to realize the area the user wants to be read.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the visual display of Kiraly et al. and with the mouse over

technique taught by prior art to increase the users control of the system and the

flexibility of the system.

As to claims 19 and 51, Kiraly et al. do not teach the preset time period at least

about one second.

However, the prior art disclosed by the applicant teaches the user places cursor

focus in front document the user wants read, (page 2, lines 24-28). It would be

necessary that the user would hold the cursor over a position to be read, so that the

system will be able to recognize that the user wants the reading to begin at that

position, and since the user must also recognize that this is the position to read, a time

of one second would allow for the user and the computer to be sure that this is the

position to read.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the visual display of Kiraly et al. and with the mouse over

technique taught by prior art to increase the users control of the system and the

flexibility of the system.

12.   Claims 20 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kiraly et al as applied to claims 16 and 48 above, and further in Chung et al.

Kiraly et al. do not teach the grammatical units are sentences.

However, Chung et al. teach the grammatical units are sentences, (the web page is parsed into the content text and passed to the text normalizer, where the text normalizer identifies the text strings, (col. 6, lines 23-24, and col. 8, lines 32-33). The text strings would necessarily include sentences.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the text reading system of Kiraly et al. with the parse tree of Chung et al. to create a system that can be easily tailored by the user and text provider to enhance the TTS converter, as taught by Chung et al. (col. 4, lines 54-56).

13.   Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, 33, 34, 38-40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Kiraly et al.

As to claims 1, 10, 33 and 42, Chung et al. teach:

(a) parsing the text of the source code designated for display into one or more grammatical units, (parsing the HTML files to produce HTML tags, HTS control codes and content text, col. 6, lines 19-21);

(b) associating a tag with each of the grammatical units, (associating new tags pertaining the rules of reading the text, these rules including tags to identify the speed to read text, and an AUDIO tag to assign audio data, col. 6, lines 30-35, and 42-48, and 53-58);

(c) associating an event handler with each of the tags, the event handler invokes text-to-speech software code (the PARAM tag indicates how quickly the text should be

spoken, where the text is spoken to the user using a TTS converter, col. 6, lines 40-46,

and 4-6); and

(d) reassembling the original web page source code with the associated tags and

event handlers, wherein when an event associated with an event handler occurs during

user interaction with a display of a text-to-speech enabled web page, the text-to-speech

software code causes the grammatical unit associated with the tag of the event handler

to be automatically spoken, (the text normalizer and tag converter reassemble the web

page by finding and replacing each of the text strings that are indicated to be replaced,

the tag converter then accesses the updated tag table to retrieve the appropriate

intonation and speed parameters and/or audio data, col. 8 lines 35-45).

Chung et al. do not teach:

a method of translating an original web page to a visually displayable text-to-

speech enabled web page, the original web page being defined by source code

including at least text designated for display; nor

visually displayable text-to-speech enabled web page source code.

However, Kiraly et al. teach:

a method of translating an original web page to a visually displayable text-to-

speech enabled web page, the original web page being defined by source code

including at least text designated for display, (the text-reader access a source of text-

based data, displays a text in a text window using a preselected standard font size,

another display with a magnified font size, and then electronically reads the document,

where the source of the document can be Microsoft Internet Explorer (col. 6, lines 13-

17, and col. 8, lines 8-10) It would be necessary that since the font of the web page is being changed, the source code relating to the font size of the web page would have to changed for the displayed font to be changed.); and

visually displayable text-to-speech enabled web page source code (the text-reader access a source of text-based data, displays a text in a text window using a preselected standard font size, another display with a magnified font size, and then electronically reads the document, col. 6, lines 13-17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the parsing technique of Chung et al. with the visual display of Kiraly et al. to increase the viewing enjoyment and comprehension of the children with respect to the text-based information of a computer program, as taught by Kiraly et al. (col. 2, lines 8-11).

As to claims 2 and 34, Chung et al. do not teach the user interacts with the display via a pointing device, and the event is a MouseOver event associated with the pointing device.

However, Kiraly et al. teach a cursor control device, (element 116, Fig. 2). It would be necessary that the cursor would include MouseOver events to interact with the display.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the parsing technique of Chung et al. with the cursor control device of Kiraly et al. to increase the viewing enjoyment and comprehension of the

children with respect to the text-based information of a computer program, as taught by Kiraly et al. (col. 2, lines 8-11).

As to claims 6, 11, 38 and 43, Chung et al. teach the grammatical units are sentences, (the web page is parsed into the content text and passed to the text normalizer, where the text normalizer identifies the text strings, (col. 6, lines 23-24, and col. 8, lines 32-33). The text strings would necessarily include sentences.).

As to claims 7 and 39, Chung et al. teach the tag is a span tag, (the Term tag spans the entire text that needs to be replaced, col. 6, lines 37-39).

As to claims 8 and 40, Chung et al. does not explicitly teach the event handler invokes the text-to-speech software code by calling a function associated with a scripting language that executes text-to-speech software code. However, Chung et al. teach the TTS converter which is a stand alone dedicated piece of hardware for performing the TTS conversion, that is provided as to interface with the browser, (col. 6, lines 2-6). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that since the TTS converter device stand alone module, it would be able to be construct the module using JavaScript functions, since java script is a program language able to create modules for web pages.

14.   Claims 3-4, 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Chung et al. in view of Kiraly et al. as applied to claims 1 and 33 above, and further

in view of the prior art disclosed by the applicant.

As to claims 3 and 35, Chung et al. and Kiraly et al. do not teach each tag has an

active region and the event handler delays invoking the text-to-speech software code

until the pointing device persists in the active region of a tag for greater than a preset

time period.

However, the prior art disclosed by the applicant teaches the user places cursor

focus in front document the user wants read, (page 2, lines 24-28). It would be

necessary that the user would have to hold the cursor over the area to be read for a

preset time period so the system will be able recognize the mouse location.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the parsing technique of Chung et al. with the visual display

of Kiraly et al. and with the mouse over technique taught by prior art to increase the

users control of the system and the flexibility of the system.

As to claims 4 and 36, Chung et al. and Kiraly et al. do not teach the preset time

period is a human perceivable time period.

However, the prior art disclosed by the applicant teaches the user places cursor

focus in front document the user wants read, (page 2, lines 24-28). It would be

necessary that the user would hold the cursor over a position to be read, allowing

enough time for the user to properly select the position to begin reading, and so the system will be able to realize the area the user wants to be read.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the parsing technique of Chung et al. with the visual display of Kiraly et al. and with the mouse over technique taught by prior art to increase the users control of the system and the flexibility of the system.

Conclusion

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is

(571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
11/10/2005

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER